

REMARKS

Claims 2-4, 6,10, 16 and 17 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 2-4, 6 and 10 are amended to correct informalities and for consistency. Claims 16 and 17 are added. Support for added claims 16 and 17 may be found at least in claims 1 and 5 as originally filed. Claims 16 and 17 rewrite claims 1 and 5, respectively, in a manner that clarifies the features recited. No new matter is added. Claims 1, 5, 7-9 and 11-15 are canceled without prejudice to, or disclaimer of, the subject matter recited in those claims. Reconsideration of the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Office Action, on page 3, rejects claims 1-6 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,916,369 to Anderson et al. (hereinafter "Anderson"). The Office Action, on page 4, rejects claims 1-6 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by EP 0870852 to Comita et al. (hereinafter "Comita"). The Office Action, on page 5, rejects claims 1-6 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by JP-A-2002-198316 to Tamura. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 16 recites, among other features, a gas introducing gap formed by the bank component and the upper lining component that is configured to communicate with the reaction vessel, and the gas introducing gap is configured such that a length of the gas introducing gap is shortened in a continuous or step-wise manner in a direction that is parallel to the horizontal standard line as a distance from the horizontal standard line increases in a width-wise direction, or remains constant at any position. Claim 16 more clearly recites the features recited in now-canceled original claim 1.

Anderson is directed to a system of supplying processing fluid to a substrate processing apparatus having walls, the inner surfaces of which define a processing chamber in which a substrate supporting susceptor is located (Abstract). Comita is directed to a single

wafer reactor having a vented lower liner for heating exhaust gas (Abstract). Tamura is directed to a vapor phase growth apparatus (Abstract). The Office Action asserts that each of Anderson, Comita and Tamura separately teach the combinations of all of the features recited in independent claims 1 and 5 (now claims 16 and 17, respectively). The analysis of the Office Action fails for at least the following reasons.

Regarding claim 16, none of Anderson, Comita or Tamura can be considered to teach the claimed gas introducing gap recited in claim 16. Each of Anderson, Comita and Tamura teach various wafer processing chambers, each chamber having a gas inlet of some kind. There is nothing in any of these references that can be considered to teach a gas introducing gap formed by a bank component and an upper lining component that is configured to communicate with the reaction vessel, and the gas introducing gap being configured such that a length of the gas introducing gap is shortened in a continuous or step-wise manner in a direction that is parallel to the horizontal standard line as a distance from the horizontal standard line increases in a width-wise direction or remains constant at any position.

Fig. 7 of Applicant's specification illustrates the claimed gas introducing gap. The gas introducing gap 60 has a length D_0 that is on the horizontal standard line HSL. As the gas introducing gap extends outwardly from the horizontal standard line HSL in a width-wise direction WL, the length of the gas introducing gap decreases as illustrated by D_1 , which is further from the horizontal standard line HSL than D_0 , for instance. Fig. 7 is a top view of the claimed apparatus. The axis of rotation of the susceptor, for example, would be directly into the page.

Because there is no mention in any of Anderson, Comita or Tamura that (1) there is a gas introducing gap and (2) that anything that can be considered to correspond to the claimed gas introducing gap varies in length as the gap progresses away from the claimed horizontal

standard line, none of these references can be considered to teach the combination of all the features recited in independent claim 16.

With regard to claim 17, this claim recites, among other features, the radius of the arc drawn by the inner periphery of the lower surface of the upper lining component is set larger than the radius of the arc drawn by the inner periphery of the top surface of the bank component. As discussed above, claim 17 more clearly recites the subject matter recited in now-canceled original claim 5.

None of Anderson, Comita or Tamura can be considered to teach this feature. Fig. 7 of Applicant's specification illustrates an arc R_3 that is drawn by the inner periphery 40_p of the lower surface $4a$ of the upper lining component 4 and has a center O' . Arc R_1 is drawn by the inner periphery 23_p of the top surface $23a$ of the bank component 23 and has a center point O . There is nothing in any of the applied references that can be considered to correspond to the claimed relationship of arcs formed by the claimed upper lining component and bank component, as recited in independent claim 17.

For at least the foregoing reasons, none of Anderson, Comita or Tamura can be considered to teach the combinations of all the features recited in added independent claims 16 and 17. Further, dependent claims 2-4, 6 and 10 are also not anticipated by Anderson, Comita or Tamura for at least the dependence of these claims on independent claims 16 and 17, as well as for the separately patentable subject matter that each of these claims recites.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 2-4, 6 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Anderson, Comita and Tamura are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 2-4, 6 and 10, and consideration and allowance of claims 16 and 17, are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



William P. Berridge
Registration No. 30,024

Michael J. Steger
Registration No. 66,034

WPB:MJS/aea

Date: October 21, 2010

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry of this filing; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
